

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/517,644	Applicant(s) YOKOYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew J. Daniels	Art Unit 1732	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Matthew J. Daniels. (3)_____.

(2) Carolyn Fischer (39091). (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 19 June 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 7 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kosaka.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The rejection under 35 USC 112 was discussed and the Examiner explained that the rejection was made in view of the recitation in the claim that the cured material had a viscosity of 3000 to 100,000 cps. However, it was asserted that cured materials would have a viscosity much higher than 100,000 cps. The Examiner stated that this rejection could be overcome by making it clear that the viscosity is a property of the materials prior to curing. Applicant's counsel also proposed an amendment to distinguish the base film from the glass substrate of Kosaka (item 14, fig. 18). The Examiner agreed to reconsider the reference to determine if any other substrates are disclosed which are interchangeable with glass in the method of Kosaka.